recitation of this limitation in the claims. The Applicant respectfully notes that a differential amplifier is referred on page 9 lines 12-14, and 23 and page 10 lines 15-19. The applicant also respectfully notes that a differential amplifier is referred to in the drawings as 25. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 15-16, 25, 37, 47 and 56 stand rejected for being misdescriptive due to the recitation of phrase "in parallel." The specification has been amended to clarify what the phrase "in parallel" means. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected due to a typographical error. Claims 31 and 32 have been amended to eliminate the typographical error. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 13, 25, 37, 47 and 56 stand rejected as unclear because the term gating does not reflect what is shown in the figures. These claims have been amended to replace "gating" with "coupling," a term clearly supported. The concern raised in the Office Action has been addressed by these amendments. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims put in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 3-7, 28-32, 40-44 and 50-54 stand rejected as unclear because the term gated does not reflect what is shown in the figures. These claims have been amended to replace "gated" with "coupled," a term clearly supported. Accordingly, this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 10, 17-20, 22-24, 35, 39-47 and 49-56 have been rendered indefinite by the deficiencies of indefinite claims. The independent claims have been amended. Accordingly, this rejection has also been overcome.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14-17, 19-20, 26-33, 36, 82-86 and 91-94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Houston et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,037,808 (hereinafter "Houston"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is an apparatus and method for adjusting clock skew. To reduce the clock skew, a non-inverted clock signal ("CLK") and an inverted clock signal ("XCLK") are connected to back-to-back inverters. The signal that takes longer to switch states has an extra inverter driving it when it switches states and the signal that switches states faster has an extra inverter fighting it when it switches states so that the resulting output signals are in the same state for a shorter period of time and the clock skew is reduced. When the input signals CLK and XCLK are not switching and are in opposite states, this circuit does not effect the output signals.

Houston, however, is a circuit which uses differential silicon-on-insulator ("SOI") amplifiers having tied floating body connections to sense and amplify the difference between two signals and outputs that signal and its complement on two output lines. Figure 10, cited by the examiner, uses the output lines DOUT and /DOUT to amplify a differential signal.

Claim 1 recites "at least a first and second signal input/output line for recciving first and second input signals and transmitting first and second output signals; and first and

second inverters each having an input and an output, said input of said first inverter connected to said output of said second inverter and to said first input/output line and said input of said second inverter connected to said output of said first inverter and to said second signal input/output line." Houston, however, does not have first and second inverters. T13 and T4 do not form an inverter because they are enabled through a sensing circuit that pulls signals apart. T5 and T14 are not an inverter for the same reason as stated above in reference to T13 and T4. In addition, Houston does not have first and second input/output lines. DOUT and /DOUT are merely output lines, not input/output lines. Houston simply fails to suggest or disclose all of the elements recited in Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. Claims 2-3, 6-8 and 14-15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1. Claims 16-17, 19-20, 26-33, 36, 82-86 and 91-94 disclose similar limitations as claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection based on Houston should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oh, U.S. Patent No. 5,838,173 (hereinafter "Oh"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Oh is a device and method for detecting a low voltage in a system. The latch 27 has an input B. The output of the latch 27 goes to C, the input to an inverter 28.

Claim 1 recites "at least a first and second signal input/output line for receiving first and second input signals and transmitting first and second output signals; and first and

second inverters each having an input and an output, said input of said first inverter connected to said output of said second inverter and to said first input/output line and said input of said second inverter connected to said output of said first inverter and to said second signal input/output line." The latch in Fig. 2 of Oh only has one input line – B – and one output line – C. The latch 27 in Oh does not have a first and second input/output lines. Oh simply fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. Claim 11 depends from Claim 1 and is allowable along with Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and Claims 1 and 11 placed in condition for allowance.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houston. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 4 and 5 each recite a circuit with "at least a first and second signal input/output line for receiving first and second input signals and transmitting first and second output signals; and first and second inverters each having an input and an output, said input of said first inverter connected to said output of said second inverter and to said first input/output line and said input of said second inverter connected to said output of said first inverter and to said second signal input/output line." As discussed above, Houston fails to disclose first and second inverters as well as first and second input/output lines. Thus, Houston does not disclose or suggest the claimed elements. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Garcia, U.S. Patent No. 5,949,259 (hereinafter "Garcia).

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 1. Thus claims 12 and 13 each disclose "at least a first and second signal input/output line for receiving first and second input signals and transmitting first and second output signals; and first and second inverters each having an input and an output, said input of said first inverter connected to said output of said second inverter and to said first input/output line and said input of said second inverter connected to said output of said first inverter and to said second signal input/output line." As mentioned above, Oh fails to disclose a circuit with first and second input/output lines. In addition, there is no motivation to combine Oh and Garcia to obtain the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 12 and 13 placed in condition for allowance.

Claims 18, 23-25, 87-90 and 95-98 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houston, as applied to claims 1-3, 6-8 and 14-15, in view of the Oh reference and further in view of the Garcia reference. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The scope of claim 18 is similar to the scope of the combination of claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 and 15. It stands rejected for the same reasons that the Examiner set forth for claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 and 15. It is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth for claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 and 15 above. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 18 should be placed in condition for allowance.

The scope of claim 23 is similar to the scope of the combination of claims 1, 11, 14, 15 and 16. It stands rejected for the same reasons that the Examiner set forth for claims 1, 11, 14, 15 and 16. It is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth for claims 1, 11, 14, 15 and 16 above. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 23 should be placed in condition for allowance.

The scope of claim 24 is similar to the scope of the combination of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16. It stands rejected for the same reasons that the Examiner set forth for claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16. It is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth for claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 above. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 24 should be placed in condition for allowance.

The scope of claim 25 is similar to the scope of the combination of claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. It stands rejected for the same reasons that the Examiner set forth for claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. It is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth for claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 above. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 25 should be placed in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: December 13, 2000

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Thomas J. D'Amico
Registration No.: 28,371
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant